

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,029	11/13/2003	Visvesvaraya A. Pentakota	TI-37058	6199
23494	7590 11/03/2004		EXAM	INER
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			LAUTURE, JOSEPH J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, I	DALLAG, IX 75265		2819	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/706,029	PENTAKOTA, VISVESVARAYA A.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Joseph Lauture	2819			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- treply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	·	,				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13	November 2003.				
2a)□		is action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□	4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5,11 and 17-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 6-10,12-16 and 18-20 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers	•				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 November 2003</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Application ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice (3) Information	te of References Cited (F10-692) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PT0-1449 or PT0/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The application has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible typographical and grammatical errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which he/she may become aware in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 17 recite on lines 6 and 7 the limitation "if said desired voltage were to be applied at said first node". This limitation is unclear and confusing because as shown in figure (2b), the desired voltage produced by the voltage source (290) is indeed coupled to the node (212).

Claims 2-4 and 18-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C 112 2nd paragraph since they depend on independent claims 1 and 17 which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/706,029

Art Unit: 2819

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Janssen et al (US 6,384,817).

Janssen et al teach in figure (2) an apparatus for applying a desired voltage at a node, the node being connected to a load impedance (Z_i), said apparatus comprising a voltage source (22) coupled to the node, the voltage source (22) generating said desired voltage; and, a current source (I_comp) also coupled to the node, wherein said current source draws a current that is approximately equal to the current across the load impedance, since the current (I_col) flowing through the load impedance (Z_i) (See clumn 5, lines 23-25) equals the current (I_comp) drawn by the current source, to avoid voltage transients (See column 5, lines 29-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caruso et al (US 5,592,167) in view of Rivoir et al (US 5,703,588) and Janssen et al (US 6,384,817).

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Caruso et al teaches in figure (5A) an analog-todigital converter for converting an analog signal to a digital code, the converter Application/Control Number: 10/706,029

Art Unit: 2819

comprising a plurality of stages (See figure 8), each of said plurality of stages generating a corresponding one of a plurality of sub-codes used to generate said digital code, each of said plurality of stages comprising as shown in figure 5A: an analog-to-digital converter, a resistor ladder having a first end and a second end, said first end of the resistor ladder being connected to a current source (46), said current source supplying to said resistor ladder an amount of current producing desired voltages across the resistors of the ladder.

Caruso et al teach the essential features of the claimed invention as set forth above except for a voltage source connected to the resistor ladder. However, Rivoir et al teach in figure (6) a digital-to-analog converter apparatus including a voltage source and a current source (54) both connected to a resistor ladder to control current distribution in the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rivoir et al into the system of Caruso et al to improve system performance and reliability because this would reduce linearity errors in the system (See column 6, lines 25-28). It would have been further obvious to provide additional circuitry to refine the digital codes obtained as required by a given application.

Regarding claim 17, Janssen teach the essential features of the claimed invention as set forth above, except that the claimed invention is implemented on an integrated circuit chip. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to carry out the invention in the form of an I.C

Application/Control Number: 10/706,029 Page 5

Art Unit: 2819

chip because this would broaden the range of applications of the invention by reducing space requirement in a system.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,029 Page 6

Art Unit: 2819

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-10, 12-16 and 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reasons For Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior arts of record fail to teach an apparatus for applying a desired voltage to a given node in a circuit, the apparatus comprising in each of a plurality of stages a current source and a voltage source both coupled to a load impedance, wherein said current source enables the voltage source to be coupled to the node without a buffer between the voltage source and the node, and wherein each stage further comprises an analog-to-digital converter and a digital-to-analog converter, a subtractor and an amplifier the output of the subtractor.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,029 Page 7

Art Unit: 2819

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Lauture, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1805. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday between 9:30 am and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Tokar can be reached at (571) 272-1812. The fax number for the organization to which this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.

Joseph Lauture Group: 2819

Date: 10/29/2004

Michael Tokar Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2800